



## Office of the Sheriff

P.O. Box P  
Lakin, Kansas 67860

James F. Jarboe, Jr.  
Sheriff

David G. Horner  
Undersheriff

Phone (620) 355-6211  
Fax (620) 355-6680

July 3, 2007

To: Kevin J. Martin, Chairman  
Michael J Copps, Commissioner  
Jonathan S Adelstein, Commissioner  
Deborah Taylor Tate, Commissioner  
Robert M McDowell, Commissioner

Federal Communications Commission  
445 12<sup>th</sup> Street SW  
Washington D. C. 20554

RE: Universal Service Reform - WC Docket No. 05-337

Dear Chairman and Commissioners:

I understand that the FCC is considering placing a cap on the use of the Universal Service Fund (USF) for wireless service. I am contacting you to express my opposition to this proposal. In western Kansas there are many areas that do not yet have adequate service. I am in charge of the local PSAP (Public Service Answering Point) and just recently we received 911 calls of citizens requesting assistance after being involved in two separate motor vehicle accidents occurring at roughly the same time.. It so happened that both sets of calls came from a less popular service provider. The callers could not be located with our PSAP equipment as the particular carrier claims to not have the funds available to install the proper equipment so as to pass the needed information to make our mapping software work. Of our four cellular providers, only one has become Phase II compliant. Even though the one is compliant, that provider is not able to fully cover the county. The other providers have even less of a footprint in the county therefore are not able to be Phase II compliant. As I travel outside of my county there are many areas where I simply do not have service until I come near to a town.

While placing a cap may provide a "quick-fix" leading to the rapid elimination of fund growth, it would also result in a terrible disservice to rural consumers. Rural consumers want and need expanded and improved wireless services in rural areas for public safety, economic development, business and personal needs that are equally important to them as they are to urban consumers. This is one of the main benefits that rural consumers receive from the universal service fund, just as Congress envisioned when it initially established the fund. A wireless-only cap is clearly anti-competitive because it singles

out wireless technology, which consumers are choosing more and more over landlines. We should be rewarding competition, not punishing it. What's more, rural Americans deserve the same access to telecom services that are available in the rest of the country—isn't that the purpose of the USF?


Consumers in rural parts of Kansas are no longer content to have access to only traditional wireline telephone service. Consumers are clearly demanding access to the benefits of mobility that only wireless service provides. This mobility results in extremely important public safety benefits in rural areas. As rural consumers travel from home to work or school, wireless service provides a very valuable safety tool. Additionally, wireless service in rural areas provides consumers with access to broadband services where broadband services are not otherwise available. This is a very important factor as we seek to bring access to the information age throughout our very rural state. Without continued support for the expansion and upgrading of the rural wireless networks, consumers will not receive these benefits where they do not already exist. Universal service support is essential if rural consumers are to be provided service and rates comparable to those available in urban areas.

I have witnessed firsthand the benefits provided by expanded wireless services in rural Kansas, and I do not want to see those benefits diminished by inappropriate USF reform. Much of the expanded availability of wireless service in rural areas would not have occurred without the USF support provided to wireless ETCs who could not have economically extended their networks without such support.

Please consider what limiting the growth of wireless access will mean for rural America. Wireless technology plays an ever-increasing role in economic growth and is a critical instrument in emergency situations, but if the recommended cap is implemented, many communities may never realize these benefits. In a country that prides itself on equality, it seems hypocritical to restrict certain individuals' access to an essential tool simply because of their geographic location, especially when they have contributed for years to the USF along with everyone else.

I respectfully request that you carefully consider these facts as you seek to reform the existing fund. I ask you to find competitively neutral proposals to slow fund growth, ensure accountability for how these funds are used and promote the continued expansion and improvement of these much needed services in rural areas by targeting funds to high cost areas rather than by targeting reforms to wireless providers. I urge you to vote against the proposed cap on universal service support for wireless service.

Sincerely,



David G. Horner, Undersheriff